

REMARKS

Entry of this Amendment and reconsideration are respectfully requested in view of the amendments made to the claims and for remarks made herein.

Claims 1-10 are pending and stand rejected.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 9 and 10 have been amended. Claims 2 and 3 have been cancelled.

Claims 1-3 and 5-10 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knutson (USP no. 4, 035, 695). Although not explicitly stated in the header statement of the rejection, applicant would note that the Office Action provides a reference to Knutson for rejection claim 4.

In rejecting the claims the Office Action asserts that Knutson teaches all the elements recited in the claims "except for the printed coil is [a] spiral loop." (see OA, page 2). The Office Action further asserts that Knutson discloses that the loop 52 with bridges 53, 54 is similar to the spiral coil of Figure 1 that has the first turn 26 and second turn 28, which includes loop 30 having [a] plurality of bridges 32. Hence, it would be obvious to use the spiral coil as taught by Knutson in Figure 1 to the inductive loop shown in Figure 2.

With regard to the rejection of claims 1-10 as being unpatentable over Knutson, applicant respectfully disagrees with and explicitly traverses the reason for the rejection. However, independent claims 1, 8, 9 and 10 have been amended to further recite a mutual inductance between the printed and air coils being determined based on a direction of

said printed coil, a direction of winding of said air coil and a length of said air coil. No new matter has been added. Support for the amendment may be found at least on page 8, line 31-page 9, line 5.

Knutson discloses microelectronic variable inductor having conductor portions that forms an inductor having parallel branches that may be selectively opened to open circuit the branches such that the total inductance of the conductor portion connected in series with a coil may be adjusted to provide a total inductance value required in a particular circuit application. (See Abstract).

Contrary to the assertions made in the Office Action, Knutson fails to provide any teaching regarding a mutual inductance that may exist between the printed circuit coil and the non-printed circuit coil. In addition, Knutson discloses adjusting a total inductance by open circuiting elements of the printed circuit portion. See, for example, col. 3, line 57-col. 4, line 4, which state, "[t]his adjustment of the inductance can take place after the circuit is completely assembled and operative, and tests are made to determine whether the inductance value of the coil 46 and the conductor 44 in series is the optimum value. This, therefore, permits trimming of the inductance value of a discrete fixed coil, which can be provided at much less cost than a discrete variable inductor. **This adjustment is much easier to perform than changing the coil to** provide a coil having a different inductance value in the event that the inductance value is not optimum.(emphasis added).

Hence, not only does Knutson fail to disclose adjusting a mutual inductance based on the direction of the printed circuit portion, the wiring direction of the non-printed circuit portion and the length of the non-printed circuit portion, as is recited in the claim.

Rather Knutson specifically teaches away from adjusting the coil length to achieve a desired total inductance.

In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met, 1. there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or combine the reference teachings, 2. there must be a reasonable expectation of success; and 3. the prior art reference must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

In this case, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been made as each of the elements recited in the claims is not disclosed by Knutson.

For the amendments made to the independent claims and for the remarks made herein, applicant submits that Knutson fails to include all the elements recited in the claims. Accordingly, the subject matter recited in the independent claims is not render obvious as the reason for the rejection of the independent claims has been overcome. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn and the independent claims allowed.


With regard to the rejection of the remaining claims, applicant submits that these claims depend from the independent claims and, hence, are not rendered obvious by Knutson at least for their dependency upon allowable base claim.

For the remarks made herein, applicant submits that the rejection of all the claims has been overcome and respectfully request the rejections be withdrawn. The issuance of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Aaron Waxler
Registration No. 48,027

Date: September 15, 2008


By: ~~Steve Cha~~
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 44,069

Mail all correspondence to:
Aaron Waxler, Registration No. 48,027
NXP, B.V.
NXP Intellectual Property Department
M/S41-SJ
1109 McKay Drive
San Jose, CA 95131
Phone: (408) 434-3000
Fax: (408) 474-9081